United Nations A/C.1/49/PV.21

General Assembly

Official Records

First Committee

21st Meeting
Wednesday, 16 November 1994, 3.30 p.m.
New York

Chairman: Mr. Valencia Rodriguez . . . . . (Ecuador)

The meeting was called to order at 4.05 p.m.

Accession of Ukraine to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT)

Mr. Zlenko (Ukraine) (*interpretation from Russian*): I have the honour to inform the Committee that today Ukraine has become the 167th State Party to the 1968 Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). The Parliament of Ukraine today passed a law on Ukraine's adherence to the Treaty. The result of the vote was more than convincing: 301 deputies voted in favour, 8 voted against and 13 abstained. The decision bears witness to the fact that the Parliament, the President and the Government of Ukraine have always been consistent and principled in their approach to nuclear weapons, particularly with respect to adherence to the NPT. Ukraine has proceeded gradually and with great difficulty, but purposefully, towards this decision.

In July 1990 the Supreme Soviet, in its Declaration of Ukraine's sovereignty, solemnly proclaimed its intention to support the three non-nuclear principles. The Parliament subsequently adopted a number of documents that confirmed Ukraine's intention to adhere to the NPT as a non-nuclear Power. An important step has been with Ukraine's adherence to the NPT.

I would like to take a few minutes now to say something about the path travelled by Ukraine in adopting this law on adhering to the NPT. This decision was not a simple matter. I would like to emphasize the special situation in which Ukraine found itself after the disintegration of the former Soviet Union; the essence of that situation was that under the NPT Ukraine was neither a nuclear nor a non-nuclear State. Ukraine inherited the nuclear weapons that had been deployed on its territory. It possessed those nuclear weapons, but, because control of those nuclear weapons was never granted to Ukraine, it could not be considered a nuclear State purely and simply. I must say that the provisions of articles I and II of the Treaty do not take full account of the unique situation in which Ukraine found itself at that time. This contradiction was eliminated by the Ukrainian Parliament's adoption of the decision to adhere to the NPT.

As to giving guarantees for our national security, after the signing of the well-known three-party statement on 14 January this year and the most recent consultations in the Parliament, the executive power in Ukraine took additional energetic measures to bring about an acceptable final agreement on those guarantees, with a view to acceding to the NPT. A great number of formal and informal meetings were held, including negotiations in the capitals of some nuclear States, as well as exchanges of letters. During these discussions and talks the interests of our government were pursued, especially with respect to getting guarantees for our national security. There is now reason to say that this question has really been settled. States such as Russia, the United States, France and the United Kingdom are prepared to cooperate with Ukraine in providing guarantees for its national security, and I think that in the near future we shall witness an important event connected with the signing of an instrument that will make it possible for Ukraine to have these guarantees. On the eve of the NPT Conference to take place in April 1995, that fact is of exceptional importance. Equally important will be the adoption of the corresponding decision at the Conference, especially

94-87088 (E)

This record contains the original texts of speeches delivered in English and interpretations of speeches delivered in the other languages. Corrections should be submitted to original speeches only. They should be incorporated in a copy of the record and be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned to the Chief of the Verbatim Reporting Section, Room C-178. Corrections will be issued after the end of the session in a consolidated corrigendum.

concerning the providing of guarantees by nuclear States of the national security of non-nuclear States.

I would also like to say that the adherence of Ukraine to the NPT confirms the reputation of our State as a reliable international partner, which is borne out by what it is doing in nuclear disarmament and in strengthening global security and stability. This step may promote the development of widespread cooperation between Ukraine, other States and relevant international organizations in the peaceful use of atomic energy, outer space and sophisticated technology, to develop the full potential of cooperation between structures that today have been established in that area. Ukraine counts on support by other States in its aspirations to make its own contribution to the common work in this field. The decision of the Parliament of Ukraine to adhere to the NPT will have an effect on the future process of disarmament and other processes that are being considered and examined here in this Committee.

The Chairman (*interpretation of Spanish*): I believe that I speak for all members of the Committee in expressing to the Government of Ukraine our congratulations on the important decision they have taken. Member States have taken due note of that decision.

Agenda items 56 to 65, 68, 71, 72 and 73 ***(continued)***

Action on draft resolutions submitted under disarmament and international security items

The Chairman: In spite of the fact that the Committee has completed action on a considerable number of draft resolutions submitted under the disarmament and international security agenda items, approximately 27 more draft resolutions remain to be acted upon during the five meetings of the Committee allotted to this phase of its work. To be able to complete the consideration of these items by the scheduled date, Friday, 18 November, the Committee should make every effort to take action on as many draft resolutions as possible at the meetings today and tomorrow.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have become sponsors of the following draft resolutions. A/C.1/49/L.2/Rev.1, Australia; A/C.1/49/L.44/Rev.1, New Zealand; A/C.1/49/L.18/Rev.1, Andorra; and A/C.1/49/L.30/Rev.1, Cambodia.

The Chairman: I would like to suggest that th Committee proceed to take a decision first on some of th draft resolutions contained in cluster 1 that I believe ar ready to be acted upon, namely, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.10, A/C.1/49/L.14 an A/C.1/49/L.41. After completing action on those dra resolutions, the Committee will proceed to take a decisio on the remaining draft resolutions contained in clusters 5 7 and 10, which I believe are also ready to be acted upon namely, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.21 A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 an A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

Before the Committee proceeds to take a decision o the draft resolutions contained in those clusters, I shall ca on those delegations wishing to introduce draft resolutions

Mr. Elaraby (Egypt): I wish first of all to convey th heartfelt congratulations of my delegation to the delegatio of Ukraine on having taken the historic step of acceding t the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapon (NPT). Our goal should be to attain the universality of tha Treaty.

It is in the context of the universality of the NPT tha I have the honour to introduce, on behalf of the sponsors draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1. That revision ha been produced as a result of extensive, broad-base consultations within the First Committee and with al parties concerned. It clearly demonstrates the flexibility an good faith of the sponsors in addressing this importan issue. The current formulation of draft resolutio A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 takes into account the view expressed by many interested delegations. It is a sincer effort to strengthen the NPT in order to attain th universality of that Treaty, which should remain ou objective.

The draft resolution should in the final analysis b regarded as an invitation to join a club as a full-fledge member, with all the rights, all the obligations and all th responsibilities that derive from joining the NPT. Th sponsors believe that all NPT parties have a solemn duty t support all efforts aimed at strengthening the non proliferation regime. On the basis of the consultations w have conducted, it is the understanding of the sponsors tha draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.11/Rev.1 commands wid support within the Committee, and the sponsors loo forward to the Committee's support.

Mr. Fouathia (Algeria) (*interpretation from French*): Like Ambassador Elaraby, I wish to convey my delegation's congratulations to the representative of Ukraine on his country's accession to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). A few weeks ago, my country itself ratified that Treaty, and it will be ready to submit its instrument of ratification in a few weeks.

I wish now to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", on behalf of its sponsors, which include almost all the coastal States of the Mediterranean: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Spain and Tunisia.

The increase in the number of sponsors compared with last year is a perfect illustration of the state of mind in most Mediterranean countries and of their willingness to work together to strengthen cooperation and security in the Mediterranean basin. Those are the principal considerations that prevailed during the formulation of the draft resolution.

This draft resolution differs from previous resolutions on this item in that it deals in a more orderly way with a broader range of questions relating to security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, taking greater account of the current situation in our region. Taking advantage of the dynamics of peace that prevail in the region, the sponsors wanted to express their sincere desire to give fresh impetus to their multifaceted relations so as to bolster the climate of confidence and security that is essential if the Mediterranean is to be a lake of peace and cooperation.

The draft resolution we are submitting to the First Committee this year restates most of the paragraphs of earlier resolutions that, in the view of the sponsors, remain timely and omits those no longer of significance. It introduces new provisions aimed more at the attainment of the objectives of this initiative, such as those relating to security and cooperation.

By the preamble, the General Assembly would bear in mind all initiatives taken by the Mediterranean countries with a view to consolidating peace, security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region. It would reaffirm the primary role of the riparian countries themselves. The Assembly would note with satisfaction the positive developments in the Middle East peace process that will lead to achieving a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region. The Assembly would further reaffirm the responsibility of all States to contribute to the stability and prosperity of the Mediterranean region and their commitment to respect the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, as well as the provisions of the 1970 Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Also in the preambular part, the Assembly would also recognize the indivisible character of security in the Mediterranean and the determination of Mediterranean countries to intensify the process of dialogue and consultations with a view to resolving the problems existing in the region, to eliminate the causes of tension, and to foster closer European-Mediterranean cooperation.

The operative part of the draft resolution draws upon the main provisions of last year's resolution 48/81 and strengthens those that encourage riparian States to continue their efforts to remove all obstacles to the promotion of confidence-building measures, disarmament measures and other measures towards the establishment of a climate of peace, security, stability and prosperity in the Mediterranean region.

In the area of disarmament and security, the Assembly would welcome with satisfaction Algeria's adherence to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and would call upon all other States in the region that have not yet done so to adhere to all the multilaterally negotiated legal instruments related to the field of disarmament. Similarly, the Assembly would encourage all States of the region to promote genuine openness and transparency in all military matters.

Further, the Assembly would recognize that the elimination of the economic and social disparities in levels of development will contribute to enhancing peace, security and cooperation among Mediterranean countries. It would encourage Mediterranean countries to strengthen further their cooperation in facing terrorist activities, which pose a threat to peace, security and stability in the region. It would invite all States of the region to address the challenge of terrorism through cooperation of all kinds, and to address criminal acts, as well as illegal drug production, consumption and trafficking, which jeopardize the friendly relations among States, hinder the development of international cooperation and result in the destruction of human rights, fundamental freedoms and the democratic basis of pluralistic society.

Furthermore, the Assembly would encourage the continued widespread support among Mediterranean countries for the convening of a conference on security and cooperation in the Mediterranean, as well as the ongoing regional consultations to create the appropriate conditions for its convening.

In view of this new dynamic motivating most of the coastal States of the Mediterranean region, which is faithfully reflected in draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, the sponsors remain confident that, as in previous sessions, this draft resolution will enjoy the support of all members of the Committee and will thus be adopted without a vote.

Mr. Marín Bosch (Mexico) (*interpretation from Spanish*): Mr. Chairman, the delegation of Mexico endorses the comments that you addressed a few moments ago to the delegation of Ukraine.

I have asked to speak to propose an oral amendment to draft resolution, on the consolidation of the regime established by the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

The delegation of Mexico has already had the honour to present this draft resolution on behalf of the co-sponsors. Since we did so, however, there has been a development that should be reflected in the text. On 9 November, the Government of Belize deposited in Mexico its instrument of ratification of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, which means that 29 States in the region are now full parties to the Treaty.

The first amendments are to the seventh preambular paragraph, where "Argentina" will now be followed by "Belize" and the number "twenty-eight" will be changed to "twenty-nine". Next, in operative paragraph 2 "Belize" is to be inserted between "Argentina" and "Brazil".

The States parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco welcome the measures taken on 9 November by the Government of Belize.

The Chairman (*interpretation from Spanish*): Due note has been taken of the oral amendments proposed by the representative of Mexico to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10.

Ms. Hasan (Pakistan): I have the honour of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia".

The establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones is a highly feasible means of controlling nuclear proliferation as well as of creating legal barriers against the threat or use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear-weapon States. Such zones can also contribute to promoting mutual trust and confidence among the States of the region and strengthen regional and international peace and security. The consolidation of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, the progress towards the conclusion of a treaty for an African nuclear-weapon-free zone and the recent moves to establish a nuclear-weapon-free zone in the South Atlantic vindicate the efficacy of the concept of nuclear-weapon-free zones.

In South Asia, the nuclear arms genie was let loose in 1974. There is an urgent need to eliminate this genie before it wreaks untold havoc. This can effectively be done by establishing a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia. This is an achievable objective. All the countries of the region have made, at the highest levels, unilateral declarations pledging not to acquire, develop or manufacture nuclear weapons. The next logical step would be to transform those pledges into a multilateral regime that would ensure that the region is freed from the presence of nuclear weapons.

In case any one regional party has apprehensions about the effect of a nuclear-weapon-free zone on its ability to ward off extra-regional threats to its security, these can be addressed by holding multilateral consultations to ensure nuclear non-proliferation in South Asia. Proposals for holding such consultations involving regional and concerned extra-regional States already exist.

Also on the table are other proposals which, if pursued, could reduce the incentives to opt for nuclear arms. The mutual and balanced reduction of conventional forces would be especially helpful in removing a major factor that leads to nuclear weaponization, and would thereby contribute to the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, has been prepared along the same lines as resolution 48/72, which was adopted by an overwhelming majority last year. We hope that the First Committee will again lend broad support to the draft resolution. By doing so, the international community would be encouraging all the States in the region to move towards the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

My colleague will now introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41.

Mr. Jilani (Pakistan): I am privileged to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". This draft resolution is co-sponsored by Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkmenistan and Viet Nam.

With the end of the cold war, there have been significant moves to decrease the overwhelming importance of nuclear weapons in the security policies of nuclear-weapon States. The commencement of negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, the initiation of a process of nuclear disarmament by the United States and the Russian Federation, the steps taken by some of the former Soviet Republics in regard to their nuclear arsenals — all these are encouraging examples of efforts to build security structures that are not based on the possession or use of nuclear weapons.

The present developments have led to a propitious climate for bringing about meaningful progress on the issue of providing security assurances to non-nuclear weapon States.

We believe that the time is ripe for substantive progress on this issue in the Conference on Disarmament. This view was also expressed by the Foreign Ministers of the Non-Aligned Movement at their recent conference in Cairo. The Foreign Ministers urged the Conference on Disarmament to negotiate, as a matter of priority, an international convention prohibiting the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons under any circumstances.

The most effective assurance against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons would obviously be their complete elimination. Until that much desired goal is achieved, the non-nuclear-weapon States must be provided with legally binding assurances against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons in order to address their security concerns.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41 reaffirms the urgent need to reach an early agreement on effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. It appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement on a common approach and, in particular, on a common formula that could be included in an international instrument of a legally binding character to ensure the security of non-nuclear-weapon States.

The draft resolution is substantively the same as General Assembly resolution 48/73, which was adopted last year by an overwhelming majority, with only a couple of abstentions. We hope that the Committee will again offer the widest support to this draft resolution.

The Chairman: I now call on the representative of the United States, who wishes to speak in explanation of vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): When the United States voted yesterday against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37, entitled "Implementation of the declaration of the Indian Ocean as a zone of peace", my delegation reserved the right to explain its vote later. We wish to do so now.

The United States warmly commends the sponsors of the draft resolution for their continuing constructive efforts to make positive changes in the text of the draft resolution. We see considerable improvement this year over last year's version.

That having been said, as was the case last year, the United States was obliged to vote against draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37. Certain navigational rights and freedoms were inadequately addressed in the text — in particular, references to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and to freedom of the high seas in conformity with the Convention. These did not adequately address full navigational freedoms.

We believe that the freedom of overflight, rights of innocent passage through territorial seas, transit passages through international straits and archipelagic sea lanes passage should be explicitly acknowledged. The United States encourages the sponsors of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.37 to give due weight to these considerations of paramount interest to maritime Powers.

The United States further encourages the sponsors of the draft resolution, and, indeed, all States in the Indian Ocean region, to take practical steps to develop and implement confidence-building measures. We believe that zones of peace can best be created and sustained through careful and successful negotiations of the relevant parties.

We would like to take this opportunity to commend the Ad Hoc Committee on the Indian Ocean for exploring alternative approaches in its work. The informal discussions between the Ad Hoc Committee and the United States and other maritime Powers offer a useful mechanism to address these important issues. We underscore that the United States welcomes such discussion with the Committee.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on some of the draft resolutions contained in cluster 1: A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.10, with the oral amendments introduced by the representative of Mexico; A/C.1/49/L.14; and A/C.1/49/L.41. After we complete action on these draft resolutions we will take decisions on remaining items in clusters 5, 7 and 10 — that is, draft resolutions A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 and A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

We have been requested to postpone action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.21.

I shall now call on those delegations wishing to explain their position before a decision is taken on all draft resolutions contained in cluster 1.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The Russian Federation intends to vote against the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". As we have stated before, achieving a comprehensive ban on nuclear tests by amending the 1963 Treaty is not feasible, because that would not affect the two nuclear Powers that are not parties to the Treaty. Furthermore, such an amendment, by virtue of the provisions of the 1963 Treaty itself, could not be accepted, because all the original parties to the Treaty are not in agreement on this matter.

However, the main consideration today is that the situation has radically changed since January 1994, when the multilateral negotiations in the Conference on Disarmament to draft a treaty on a comprehensive ban on nuclear-weapon tests began. In those negotiations, in which all the nuclear States, as well as other concerned States, participated, an enormous amount of work was done which has now made it possible to talk about concluding a treaty. In these circumstances, the continuation of any sort of parallel process moving beyond the prohibition of nuclear-weapon tests would distract the world community's attention from the work being done in Geneva and the negotiations under way there, while also creating an unjustified illusion regarding the possibility of alternative negotiations.

We oppose any steps that would create such illusions, and we oppose any plans, if they exist in anyone's mind, to get around the negotiating process taking place in Geneva by putting forward texts that have not resulted from the negotiations. We are convinced that only through the active continuation of efforts under way in the Conference on Disarmament, with the mandatory participation of all nuclear States, will it be possible to attain a truly comprehensive — all-inclusive — prohibition of nuclear weapon tests.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): Once again the United Kingdom will abstain in the vote on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41, "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons". We shall do so because the text does not refer clearly to the essential relationship between the security assurance given by a nuclear-weapon State and the necessity for a binding commitment from recipient States on nuclear non-proliferation, preferably through adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT). We believe that establishing this relationship supports the non-proliferation objectives to which the international community is committed. The relationship is spelled out in the United Kingdom's unilateral declaration on security assurances, which is referred to in the draft resolution. We regret that the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41 does not reflect this important element. That is why we are unable to support it.

Meanwhile, the United Kingdom has repeatedly stressed its willingness to continue to consider ways and means to achieve effective international arrangements. In recent months we have been working with other nuclear-weapon States to try to agree on a joint text on assurances that might meet the concerns reflected in the present draft resolution. We continue to be engaged in that effort.

Mr. Starr (Australia): On behalf of Canada, New Zealand and Australia, I would like to make a statement before the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, on negative security assurances.

Canada, Australia and New Zealand have consistently supported the conclusion of effective international arrangements to ensure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons. Our delegations have been active in pursuit of this high-priority

goal, including in putting forward concrete proposals and ideas. Our delegations have been equally consistent in stressing the necessary linkage between such assurances, on the one hand, and, on the other hand, acceptance by the beneficiary States of unambiguous and internationally verified nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

It is not reasonable, we believe, for any State to expect to benefit from security assurances if it is not itself willing to contribute to assuring the nuclear security of others by subscribing to the international nuclear non-proliferation regime. The overwhelming majority of non-nuclear-weapon States have displayed such commitment by acceding to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT), to regional non-proliferation accords of comparable scope or to both. There is no doubt as to the nuclear reassurance they have extended to others, pursuant to the NPT and other accords. They are demonstrably and verifiably non-nuclear-weapon States. This makes it all the more appropriate that the nuclear-weapon States move decisively in the context of next years's NPT Conference to put in place the matching general and legally binding positive and negative security assurances which are required in our contemporary world.

As in previous years, our delegations have urged the sponsors of the draft resolution to reflect in the text the importance of binding non-nuclear-weapon State non-proliferation commitments. In our view, the continued absence of such references detracts from and significantly undermines the credibility of a text which we would otherwise wish to co-sponsor. We wish to stress clearly the serious light in which we view this conscious omission. Our delegations will vote in favour of the draft resolution on the basis that the overwhelming majority of its supporters in fact share our concerns in this regard.

Our support also reflects the expectation, as we approach the 1995 Conference, that the community of States parties to the NPT will indeed seize the new opportunities available, with a view to extending a package of legally binding security assurances to non-nuclear-weapon States which act in full compliance with their own binding multilateral nuclear non-proliferation commitments.

Mr. Chandra (India): The Indian delegation wishes to explain its vote on the draft resolution entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", contained in document A/C.1/49/L.14, as well as its vote on other resolutions on nuclear-weapon-free zones.

It has always been our view that nuclear disarmament is a global issue that can only be resolved globally and addressed through a global approach. The goal of nuclear disarmament, leading to the complete elimination of nuclear weapons, cannot be achieved by partial measures. We do not consider the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones as being in accord with this global approach. The global reach of nuclear weapons and their deployment and stationing in different parts of the world render nuclear-weapon-free zones less than effective in promoting global nuclear disarmament.

I should say, further, that the United Nations has endorsed the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones only after an appropriate definition of the region, based on a correct perception of its geographical extent and taking into account the full range of security concerns of the States of the region. Moreover, such zones must be established on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at and with the consent of the States of the region concerned. This view was fully reflected in the Disarmament Commission's 1993 consensus paper on regional disarmament. In this context, while we see no great merit in resolutions calling for the establishment of nuclear-weapon-free zones, we are willing to go along with those that are based on consensus and fulfil the United Nations established criteria that I have cited.

However, we are unable to go along with draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, which calls for the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia, as it fails to fulfil any of the United Nations endorsed criteria and lacks consensus. We shall therefore vote against the draft resolution, and we call for a recorded vote.

Mr. Florent (France) *(interpretation from French)*: My delegation would like to explain its position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons".

As it did last year, my delegation will abstain in the vote on this draft resolution because it contains no link between security assurances given to non-nuclear-weapon States and a commitment by them not to acquire or manufacture nuclear weapons — a link such as that in the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons (NPT). We feel that the absence of any reference to a commitment to non-proliferation, and in particular to the NPT, is especially regrettable now, with the NPT Review and Extension Conference only months away.

Moreover, the text continues to employ language that fails to take into account the way in which the international situation has developed since the end of the cold war; the threats to international security have changed their character, the increased risks of proliferation now being the main threat. France, for its part, considers that the question of security assurances puts at risk the international responsibilities of the nuclear Powers, respect for non-proliferation commitments and defence needs.

With regard to non-proliferation commitments, France feels that only States that have undertaken and respect international, legally binding commitments, such as adherence to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, should benefit from such security assurances. France is prepared to pursue its efforts to arrive at an acceptable solution that takes into account the three elements mentioned earlier. Unfortunately, in view of the lack of progress on this draft, compared with last year, my delegation can only abstain again. However, it continues to hope that future texts will be more balanced, taking into account the necessary non-proliferation commitments.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, entitled "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water", was introduced by the representative of Mexico at the Committee's 12th meeting, on 3 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, India, Indonesia, Islamic Republic of Iran, Mexico, Mongolia, Nepal, Nigeria, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Tanzania, Venezuela, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Bahamas, Senegal, Philippines, Thailand and Peru.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Cape Verde, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Ethiopia, Fiji, Ghana, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Jamaica, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Qatar, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Israel, Russian Federation, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Abstaining:

Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Canada, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Turkey, Ukraine

The draft resolution was adopted by 94 votes to 4, with 44 abstentions.

The Chairman: The Committee will now take action on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.10, with the oral amendments submitted by the representative of Mexico.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10, entitled "Consolidation of the regime established by the treaty for the prohibition of nuclear weapons in Latin America and the Caribbean (Treaty of Tlatelolco)", was introduced by the

representative of Mexico at the 12th meeting of the Committee, on 3 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bahamas, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Chile, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Mexico, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Haiti.

As you have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10 was orally amended at today's meeting by the representative of Mexico.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote.

If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.10, as orally amended, was adopted.

The Chairman: We shall now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, entitled "Establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 16 November 1994, and is sponsored by Bangladesh and Pakistan.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bolivia, Botswana, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

Bhutan, India, Mauritius

Abstaining:

Algeria, Brazil, Cuba, Cyprus, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Madagascar, Myanmar, Viet Nam

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14 was adopted by 130 votes to 3, with 9 abstentions.

The Chairman: We will now proceed to take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41, entitled "Conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons", was introduced by the representative of Pakistan at the 21st meeting of the Committee, on 16 November 1994, and it is sponsored by the following countries: Bangladesh, Colombia, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Islamic Republic of Iran, Madagascar, Myanmar, Nepal, Pakistan, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Turkmenistan and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was taken.

In favour:

Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Guatemala, Guinea, Guyana, Haiti, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Kuwait, Kyrgyzstan, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lebanon, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Malta, Marshall Islands, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Micronesia (Federated States of), Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Qatar, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Samoa, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, Solomon Islands, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Swaziland, Sweden, Syrian Arab Republic, Thailand, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Republic of Tanzania, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia, Zimbabwe

Against:

None

Abstaining:

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.41 was adopted by 142 votes to none, with 3 abstentions.

The Chairman: I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their vote after the vote.

Mr. Ledogar (United States): First of all, I should like to explain the United States vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, "Amendment of the Treaty Banning Nuclear Weapon Tests in the Atmosphere, in Outer Space and under Water". We voted against this draft resolution for the following reasons.

In 1993 the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva took a decision to start negotiations on a comprehensive nuclear-test ban treaty (CTBT) in 1994. In January 1994 a negotiating mandate was agreed and the CTBT negotiations commenced. As noted in this year's report of the Conference on Disarmament to the General Assembly, the Conference's Ad Hoc Committee on a Nuclear Test Ban

> "worked intensively during the 1994 session" *(A/49/27, para. 25.*

The Conference on Disarmament has agreed to continue negotiations during next month's intersessional period, and has recommended the re-establishment of the Ad Hoc Committee at the outset of the Conference's 1995 session.

The United States welcomed the Conference's decision to negotiate a CTBT. We are satisfied with the progress in the negotiations so far, although we recognize that there is much more work to do. The United States seeks a comprehensive test ban treaty at the earliest possible time, and we will redouble our efforts when we resume our work in Geneva two weeks from now. Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1 is not helpful to this negotiating process, and it implies a lack of faith in the Conference on Disarmament as a forum for the CTBT negotiations. This is not the way to promote success in achieving the objectives of a successful negotiation on the CTBT.

A limited test ban Treaty Amendment Conference is not a suitable forum for negotiating a CTBT. Moreover, the United States continues to oppose convening another special meeting of the States parties to the limited test ban Treaty in order to

> "review developments and assess the situation regarding a comprehensive test ban and to examine the feasibility of resuming the work of the Amendment Conference". *(A/C.1/49/L.9/Rev.1, para. 2)*

I should also like to explain our vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

My delegation attaches great importance to the nuclear non-proliferation initiatives in South Asia. In this regard,

and with reference to operative paragraph 2, we call on all States in the region to ensure that their policies do not prejudice the objectives of this draft resolution. At the same time, my delegation wishes to note that United States support for the draft resolution should not be interpreted as a blanket endorsement of nuclear-weapon-free zones, as might be inferred from the third preambular paragraph.

Mr. Wiranataatmadja (Indonesia): The Indonesian delegation wishes to clarify its abstention in the voting on the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

The position of Indonesia concerning this issue is well known. Indonesia, together with other countries of the Association of South-East Asian Nations, continues in its efforts to promote South-East Asia as a nuclear-weapon-free zone, in accordance with the Final Document of the first special session of the General Assembly devoted to disarmament. Specifically, in paragraphs 33 and 60 of that document, the General Assembly has declared that the establishment of such zones should be on the basis of arrangements freely arrived at among the States of the region concerned. In paragraph 61, the Assembly also stated that the process of establishing them in different parts of the world should be encouraged and that the States participating in such zones should undertake to comply fully with all the objectives, purposes and principles of the agreements or arrangements.

As efforts to achieve agreement on this issue are still to be conclusively pursued, my delegation deemed it essential to abstain in the voting on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14.

Mr. Berdennikov (Russian Federation) (*interpretation from Russian*): The delegation of the Russian Federation voted in favour of the draft resolution contained in document A/C.1/49/L.41, on the conclusion of effective international arrangements to assure non-nuclear-weapon States against the use or threat of use of nuclear weapons.

We support the rightful aspirations of non-nuclear-weapon States parties to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons to guarantees against the use of nuclear weapons. We are impressed by the fact that this draft resolution appeals to all States to work actively towards an early agreement between nuclear-weapon States on a common formula for such guarantees.

Russia's military doctrine, as stated by the President of Russia and confirmed by him on 9 November 1993, contains the following formula for such guarantees:

> "The Russian Federation will not use its nuclear weapons against any non-nuclear-weapon State party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons of 1 July 1968, except in cases of (a) armed attack against a State member of an alliance with a nuclear-weapon State, against the Russian Federation, its territory, armed forces and other troops or its allies; and (b) joint action of such a State with a nuclear-weapon State in the implementation of or support of an invasion or armed attack against the Russian Federation, its territory, armed forces and other troops or its allies."

Mr. Yativ (Israel): I should like to explain Israel's vote on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.14, on the establishment of a nuclear-weapon-free zone in South Asia.

Israel supported the draft resolution because it believes in the regional approach in arms control. However, Israel also believes that regional disputes should be resolved by the parties concerned in the region through free and mutual negotiations which would lead to agreements accepted by all the parties involved. Any attempt to impose agreements from outside the region — for example, by an international organization — is likely to impede those efforts.

The Chairman: The Committee will now proceed to take action on pending draft resolutions — those contained in documents A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, A/C.1/49/L.26 and A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2.

We will first take action on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1 is sponsored by the following countries: Austria, Benin, Canada, Chile, Colombia, Cuba, Jordan, Mauritius, Pakistan, Poland, Sweden and Ukraine.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1 was adopted.

The Chairman: We now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26.

I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26, entitled "United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Africa, United Nations Regional Centre for Peace and Disarmament in Asia and the Pacific and United Nations Regional Centre for Peace, Disarmament and Development in Latin America and the Caribbean", was introduced by the representative of Togo at the Committee's 15th meeting, on 9 November 1994. It is sponsored by the following countries: Argentina, Bangladesh, Belize, Bolivia, Brazil, Brunei Darussalam, Chile, Costa Rica, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Gambia — on behalf of the States Members of the United Nations that are members of the African Group of States — Guatemala, Honduras, Jamaica, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, Nicaragua, Pakistan, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Saint Lucia, Singapore, South Africa, Sri Lanka, Suriname, Swaziland, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Uruguay, Venezuela and Viet Nam.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it be adopted without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26 was adopted.

The Chairman: we shall now proceed to draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. Kheradi (Secretary of the Committee): Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2 entitled "Strengthening of security and cooperation in the Mediterranean region", was introduced by the representative of Algeria at the 21st meeting of the Committee on 16 November 1994 and is sponsored by the following countries: Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Egypt, France, Greece, Italy, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malta, Mauritania, Monaco, Morocco, Portugal, San Marino, Spain and Tunisia.

The Chairman: The sponsors of this draft resolution have expressed the wish that it by the Committee without a vote. If I hear no objection, I shall take it that the Committee wishes to act accordingly.

Draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2 was adopted.

The Chairman: We have finished taking action on those pending draft resolutions. I shall now call on those representatives who wish to explain their position on the draft resolutions just adopted.

Mr. Rhee (Republic of Korea): I wish to explain the position of my delegation on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26, on United Nations regional centres.

My delegation joined in the adoption of the draft resolution without a vote. This draft resolution is very important, because the regional centres, my delegation believes, have substantially contributed to the cause of the United Nations disarmament efforts. As one Member State that has assiduously participated in the activities organized by the regional centres, we cannot but commend the centres and their efforts. In this regard, my country substantially increased its financial contributions to the Regional Centre in Asia and the Pacific at this year's pledging conference. This year my delegation seriously considered becoming a sponsor of this draft resolution. However, operative paragraph six made it difficult for us to do so. Although we fully sympathize with the concerns expressed in the paragraph, my delegation is of the view that it could cause practical difficulties. My delegation sincerely hopes that some middle ground can be found in this regard next year.

Mr. Ledogar (United States of America): The United States joined in the adoption without a vote of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, entitled "Report of the United Nations Disarmament Commission". In this connection, however, I wish to state that the United States does not interpret the language in operative paragraph 10 of that draft resolution to mean that there should be a third agenda item for the 1995 session of the Disarmament Commission. Any decision on its agenda is to be made at the Commission's organizational session. My delegation must make it clear even now, however, that the United States does not support the inclusion of a third agenda item in 1995, and that it will stand by that position during the forthcoming organizational session of the Disarmament Commission. In 1991 the Commission adopted, in principle, a three-item, phased approach to its agenda, but it has applied that approach in a pragmatic manner. Thus, the subject of the role of science and technology was kept on the agenda for four years. The nuclear disarmament item has been in its current formulation on the Commission's agenda since 1991. The United States is of the firm view that at its 1995 session the Commission should concentrate all its efforts on concluding that item

and on discussing in greater depth the subject of international arms transfers.

Mr. Weston (United Kingdom): I wish first to explain the United Kingdom's position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.5/Rev.1, on the report of the Disarmament Commission.

Although the United Kingdom joined the consensus, we wish to make it clear that we do not regard this draft resolution as in any way binding on the organizational session of the Disarmament Commission — in particular, on its decisions on whether to adopt a new third agenda item for its 1995 session and, if so, on what that item should be. Given the intensive activity on disarmament already scheduled for 1995, particularly the Non-Proliferation Treaty Conference and the negotiations on a comprehensive test-ban treaty, my delegation believes that in 1995, despite the agreement in principle that there should normally be three items discussed each year, the Commission should limit itself, exceptionally, to the two existing items, with a view to concluding its work on the nuclear disarmament item, which by then will be in its fifth year, and engaging in substantive work on the illicit arms transfers item. We see no merit in devoting scarce time and resources to another item. In any case, neither of the proposals contained in operative paragraph 10 has any great appeal to us.

I would like to go on to explain our position on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.26. We were happy to support that draft resolution, which was adopted, on the United Nations regional centres for peace and disarmament. We commend the activities being carried out by the regional centres, and we fully support their continued work. But, as we have made clear on previous occasions, it is important that the regional centres should not impose any additional burden on the United Nations regular budget and that any new activities should continue to be funded by voluntary contributions. We assume, in the absence of any statement by the Secretariat, that the adjustments requested in the draft resolution will not impose any new financial burden on the United Nations budget.

Mr. Yativ (Israel): Israel joined the consensus on draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. My delegation wishes to remind the Committee that its position is that all regional security matters pertaining to the Middle East are subject to the peace negotiations. Operative paragraph 5 of the draft resolution does not take this into account. Accordingly, we have to reiterate that our position is that in the region of the Middle East the establishment of a mutually verifiable nuclear-weapons-free zone in due course is the suitable solution.

Mr. Hasan (Iraq) (*interpretation from Arabic*): My delegation supported draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2, adopted by consensus, because of the noble causes reflected therein. However, it has a reservation on the wording of the seventh preambular paragraph.

Mr. Moradi (Islamic Republic of Iran): I wish to express my delegation's strong reservations on the seventh preambular paragraph of draft resolution A/C.1/49/L.47/Rev.2. The Islamic Republic of Iran is of the view that the so-called peace process in the Middle East will not lead to full restoration of the inalienable rights of the Palestinian people, nor achieve a comprehensive, just and lasting peace in the region.

The Chairman: The Committee has finished its work for this afternoon's meeting. So far we have adopted 27 draft resolutions or decisions, and there are still 20 draft resolutions on which the Committee has to take action.

Delegations may notice that during our current phase there is occasionally a slight delay in starting meetings. This is inevitable, for a number of reasons, of which delegations are well aware, including last-minute consultations and consequent requests by some delegations for a delay. Accordingly, I ask delegations to bear with us on this matter. Members can rest assured that everything possible is being done, and will continue to be done, to start our meetings on time. In that context, I am confident that delegations will be happy to note that, on the basis of statistical data provided by Conference Services on a weekly basis, the First Committee has registered one of the best records in recent years with respect to the fullest possible use of the time and resources allocated to it.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.